Remarks

Claims 1-42 are pending in this application. In the final rejection, the examiner has rejected all the claims under § 112, ¶ 2. Claims 1-9, 18, 21-30, 36 and 39-40 stand rejected under § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,311,223 issued to Bodin et al. Though claim 15 has not been specified in the rejection, this appears to be an oversight. Thus, we have considered claim 15 as being rejected as anticipated like in the original action. Claims 10-14, 16-17, 19-20, 31-35, 37-38, and 41-42 stand rejected under §103 (a) as being unpatentably obvious over Bodin.

With respect to the § 112, ¶ 2 rejections, it is believed the new amendments have eliminated the grounds for this rejection.

With respect to the anticipation and obviousness rejections, it is believed the claims as now amended distinguish the present invention over Bodin. As discussed in the last Office Action, with the Bodin process, two completely separate and distinct tokenization processes exist. The first Bodin tokenization process involves tokenizing HMTL tags using a lookup table (See Lookup Table at top of Col. 6). These tag-related tokens are unique to and created for the Bodin process. They are not integrated with the particular compression application used. Bodin, in fact, uses conventional compression techniques. See Col. 6, lines 33-36. As one skilled in the art will recognize, these conventional compression techniques use a second tokenization process. This second process requires the transmission of dictionary information for not only the content information, but also the tags when using the compression application. The transmission of this tag-related dictionary information weighs on compression efficiency.

The process of the present invention overcomes these efficiency problems by integrating the initial markup language tokenization process with the later compression-related tokenization process. Table A of the original application shows the table used for the initial tokenization of the mark-up language (here, HTML). Table B shows the table used for the later compression-related tokenization process. As can be seen from comparing the tables, the tokens created for the tags in Table A (e.g., on Page 22 "0x105" denotes HTML tag "<A") are already recognizable within the second tokenization process. Thus, referring now to Huffman compression-token Table B, we see that the tag-related identifier "0x105" is an already known, recognizable token, which is already associated with a particular binary code. In this case, "110000001000111010001000." Because the tokens created in the mark-up tokenization process are already defined within the compression application (Huffman coding in the preferred embodiment), there is no need to transmit dictionary information regarding the tag-related tokens to the compression algorithm. This is because they these tokens are already recognizable by the compression algorithm. Thus, the tag-related tokens are directly useable by the compression algorithm. This, therefore, reduces the size of the compressed representation of the data in comparison to Bodin. Reducing the size of the data for transmission or storage is the whole purpose of any compression technique. Valuable processing time is also saved in both the encoding and decoding phases. The compression process overall is more efficient.

Claims 1 and 21 have been modified to more specifically incorporate these distinguishing principles as inherently suggested by the Examiner on Page 4 of the Final Rejection. This being done, it is believed the application is in condition for allowance.

If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned by telephone prior to issuing a subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Marshall S. Honeyman
Reg. No. 48,114

MSH/tjd

SHOOK, HARDY, & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64018-2613
816/474-6550

THE COMMISSIONER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO CHARGE ANY ADDITIONAL AMOUNT REQUIRED, OR CREDIT ANY OVERPAYMENT, TO ACCOUNT NO. 19-2112.